



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Theses and Dissertations

Thesis and Dissertation Collection

2004-06

Comparison of Military and Business Culture and their Impact in Cross-Cultural Teams

Uztariz de Cardenas, Ana Susana

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/48666>



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

COMPARISON OF MILITARY AND BUSINESS CULTURE AND THEIR IMPACT IN CROSS- CULTURAL TEAMS

by

Ana Susana Uztariz de Cárdenas

June 2004

Co-Advisors:

Roxanne V. Zolin

Leslie E. Sekerka

~~Distribution authorized to U.S. Government Agencies only; (premature dissemination); (June 2004). Other requests for this document must be referred to Superintendent, Code 261, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000 (or sponsor, as appropriate) via the Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944, Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218.~~

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



NAVAL
POSTGRADUATE
SCHOOL

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY.

May 11, 2016

SUBJECT: Change in distribution statement for *Comparison of Military and Business Culture and their impact in Cross-Cultural Teams* – June 2004.

1. Reference: Uztariz de Cardenas, Ana Susana. *Comparison of Military and Business Culture and their impact in Cross-Cultural Teams*. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, June 2004.

UNCLASSIFIED [Distribution authorized to U.S. Government Agencies only; premature dissemination; June 2004.].

2. Upon consultation with NPS faculty, the School has determined that this thesis may be released to the public, and its distribution is unlimited effective 5/29/2016.

University Librarian
Naval Postgraduate School

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 2004	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Comparison of Military and Business Culture and Their Impact in Cross-Cultural Teams			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Ana Susana Uztariz de Cárdenas				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution authorized to U.S. Government Agencies only; (premature dissemination); (June 2004). Other requests for this document must be referred to Superintendent, Code 261, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000 (or sponsor, as appropriate) via the Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944, Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218. Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) The challenges involved in developing new products for the marketplace or for military use in today's dynamic and technologically advanced environment are more complex than ever before. To meet the demands of these challenges, military and business organizations need to cooperate and manage multiple tasks jointly to provide successful and improved products for end users and customers. The competitive advantage gained by superior products determines the survival of a military force on the battlefield or, conversely, a business in the free-trade market. As such, military and business organizations must actively collaborate as they pursue common goals, especially when cross-functional teams come together sharing joint operations or tasks. Each particular organization is expected to be distinguished by its unique culture, which may serve to support or hinder the process of accomplishing the organizations' and members' shared goals. Observing that their purposes are often based upon very different starting assumptions, it is surmised that different operating cultures exist for organizational members representing these entities. Consequently, as members come together in cross-functional teams from different organizations representing the military and business culture, there may be a potential for situational conflict. This study creates propositions based upon the existing research literature, that identify the potential areas where conflicts may ensue from cultural differences, when cross-functional teams comprised by military and business members come together, to achieve a shared task.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Culture, Teams, Conflict			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

~~Distribution authorized to U.S. Government Agencies only; (premature dissemination); (June 2004). Other requests for this document must be referred to Superintendent, Code 261, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5000 (or sponsor, as appropriate) via the Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944, Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218.~~

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

COMPARISON OF MILITARY AND BUSINESS CULTURE AND THEIR IMPACT IN CROSS-CULTURAL TEAMS

Ana Susana Uztariz de Cárdenas
Lieutenant Colonel, Venezuelan Air Force
Military Aviation School of Venezuela, 1985

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2004**

Author: Ana Susana Uztariz de Cárdenas

Approved by: Roxanne V. Zolin
Thesis Co-Advisor

Leslie E. Sekerka
Thesis Co-Advisor

Douglas A. Brook
Dean, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

The challenges involved in developing new products for the marketplace or for military use in today's dynamic and technologically advanced environment are more complex than ever before. To meet the demands of these challenges, military and business organizations need to cooperate and manage multiple tasks jointly to provide successful and improved products for end users and customers. The competitive advantage gained by superior products determines the survival of a military force on the battlefield or, conversely, a business in the free-trade market. As such, military and business organizations must actively collaborate as they pursue common goals, especially when cross-functional teams come together sharing joint operations or tasks. Each particular organization is expected to be distinguished by its unique culture, which may serve to support or hinder the process of accomplishing the organizations' and members' shared goals. Observing that their purposes are often based upon very different starting assumptions, it is surmised that different operating cultures exist for organizational members representing these entities. Consequently, as members come together in cross-functional teams from different organizations representing the military and business culture, there may be a potential for situational conflict. This study creates propositions based upon the existing research literature, that identify the potential areas where conflicts may ensue from cultural differences, when cross-functional teams comprised by military and business members come together, to achieve a shared task.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
	1. Military	2
	2. Business.....	2
B.	OBJECTIVE	3
C.	PURPOSE.....	4
D.	SCOPE	4
E.	TERMS AND THEORY	4
	1. Culture	4
	2. Teams	5
	3. Conflict.....	5
F.	METHODOLOGY	6
G.	ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY.....	6
II.	ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	9
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	9
B.	IMPORTANCE OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE	9
C.	SELECTION AND ACCULTURATION PROCESS	10
	1. Military	10
	2. Business.....	12
D.	WORK LIFE	15
	1. Military	15
	2. Business.....	16
E.	HIERARCHY.....	17
	1. Military	17
	2. Business.....	18
F.	MARKET.....	19
	1. Military	19
	2. Business.....	21
G.	SUMMARY	21
III.	TEAMS	25
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	25
B.	BACKGROUND ON CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAMS	26
C.	TURNOVER.....	27
D.	COHESIVENESS	28
	1. Military	29
	2. Business.....	30
E.	LEADERSHIP	31
	1. Military	32
	2. Business.....	33
F.	SUMMARY	36

IV.	CONCLUSIONS	39
A.	SUMMARY AND FINDINGS	39
B.	LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY	41
C.	FUTURE RESEARCH	41
	LIST OF REFERENCES	43
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	47

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Comparing Military and Business Selection Process.	14
Table 2.	Comparing Military and Business Acculturation Process.	15
Table 3.	Comparing Military and Business Work Life.....	17
Table 4.	Comparing Military and Business Hierarchical Forms.	20
Table 5.	Comparing Military and Business Market Form	22
Table 6.	Comparing Military and Business Cohesiveness.....	31
Table 7.	Comparing Military and Business Leadership.....	37
Table 8.	Organizational Culture Propositions.....	40
Table 9.	Team Propositions	41

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis co-advisor, Professor Roxanne V. Zolin, for her valuable insights, guidance, and continuous encouragement throughout the development of this thesis. Her optimism and patience provided the needed direction to achieve the completion of this important goal in my career.

I would also like to thank my thesis co-advisor, Professor Leslie E. Sekerka, for her professional insights and comments, as well as her personal encouragement throughout the entire process. She challenged me to work beyond my known capabilities.

My husband Pedro deserves a special acknowledgment for his invaluable support, friendship, and encouragement. Our children, Adriana, Alejandro, and Mariana, were also a valuable asset and I would like to thank them for having faith in me.

Finally, I would also like to thank my countrymen, Omar Piña, José Landa, and Orlando Aponte, along with their respective families, for their continuous support and words of encouragement that made this effort worthwhile and pleasant at the Naval Postgraduate School, and especially Monterey.

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, Ana Victoria Escalona.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To face the multiple technological challenges encountered in modern times, both military and business personnel are engaged in actions that can potentially threaten the survival of their organizations and its members. For those in the military, their physical safety, life itself, is the focus of concern. For those in industry, their commercial viability as a business entity and reputation are at stake. Being conscious of their purposes, it is inferred that cultural differences may emerge when military and business members come together to undertake responsibilities and collaboration to deliver or to improve a product to the end user or customer. This is often the case encountered with defense initiatives. An example where military members come together is through project teams known as Integrated Product Team (IPT), which are also known in industry as cross-functional teams. In order to know how cultural differences between military and business members contribute to or detract from teamwork, I examine the selection process, acculturation, work life, organizational form, leadership, cohesiveness, and turnover, and compare each of these factors by type of organization (military versus business). To undertake this study I read the literature on organizational culture, considered research previously conducted in this area, as well as consulting with other associated and relevant applied works. By comparing the military and business culture, I have identified potential areas for conflict that are highlighted in the propositions created throughout this research.

Since this research examines how conflicts can arise in the workplace, readers will benefit by gaining awareness of such problems, and by recognizing the impact of cultural differences in teams where military and business members come together.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Imagine the challenge of building a new twenty-first century fighter plane to replace the F-16 Falcon and A-10 Thunderbolt II. This is only possible if military and business organizations are willing to cooperate and jointly manage multiple technological challenges. Each particular sector is expected to be distinguished by a unique culture, which may serve to support or hinder the process of accomplishing the organizations' and members' shared goals. That is, toward the performance of building fighter planes. Both the military and business are engaged in actions that can potentially threaten their survival. For those in the military, their physical safety, life itself, is the focus of concern. For those in industry, their commercial viability as a business entity and reputation are at stake. Observing that their purposes are based upon very different starting assumptions, it is surmised that different operating cultures will emerge from organizational members, individuals who work for these organizations. Consequently, as military and business cultures undertake collaboration, as is often the case in military defense initiatives, despite members' best efforts to work efficiently and effectively, conflicts may ensue from their cultural differences.

One prime example where military and industry members come together is through project teams known as Integrated Product Teams (IPTs). A number of acquisition reforms have been implemented in the Department of Defense (DoD), including some new programs, some borrowed from industry. The Integrated Product and Process Development (IPPD) is an example. The DoD IPPD handbook defines IPPD as, "A management process that integrates all activities from product concept through production/field support, using a multifunctional team, to simultaneously optimize the product and its manufacturing and sustainment processes to meet cost and performance objectives" (p. 5). Hence, the IPPD ensures a system that satisfies customer needs by providing quality data and products that support the acquisition management decisions that an IPT implements. IPTs are relevant to this research because they serve as a key example of an organization's cooperation and sharing tasks. According to the

DoD IPT guide, IPTs are cross-functional teams that are formed for the specific purpose of delivering a product for an external or internal customer. Members of IPTs come from different sectors, such as technical, manufacturing, business, and different organizations to support and develop required products. IPT, seen as the core of IPPD implementation, has guided the DoD acquisition system since 1995. Each organization's culture needs to be examined independently, which is described in the next section, beginning with the culture found in business type organizations.

1. Military

Upon entrance into the military system, members undergo a process in which new values and behaviors play an important role in adaptation. Training in military academies and other special military units facilitate the recruit's transition into new social roles and status. New cadets share a common life together where multiple activities such as military and physical training, academic classes, sports, and social events, gradually shape their values and behaviors. An intense program develops a strong culture and acceptance of a subordinate and unselfish role to serve one's the nation. Soldiers must be prepared to kill and die for their country. Military ethics, identification, and conviction toward shared goals distinguish military institutions from any other in a society (Trainor, 2000, p. 7). Military culture emphasizes values such as discipline and self-sacrifice, which are vital to achieve effectiveness on the battlefield. Basic individual freedom in the military is often limited for the benefit of discipline. The Armed Forces reserve the right to shape individual's behavior through strict rules that would be unacceptable for a civilian employee in a business environment (CSIS Report, 2000).

2. Business

The culture of most organizations begins with an individual's joining the firm and the very initial phases of their recruitment. Corporations and business entities follow procedures to recruit individuals with the skills to fit within the organization. Newly recruited personnel start their organizational membership with a process of acculturation. Members begin by learning about the organization and become exposed to behaviors, norms, and prescribed roles that the organization requires. As newcomers interact with other members over a period of time, a natural process of organizational identification begins. Albert, Blake, and Dutton (2000) assert: "identity and identification explain one

means by which individuals act on behalf of the group or the organization. They help to explain the direction and persistence of individual and more collective behaviors” (p. 2). Therefore, we can see how employees adopt practices and standards for conducting business so they may follow the organization’s philosophy and style.

Research on organizational culture started in the late 1930’s, during the last phase of Hawthorne’s studies at the Western Electric Company in Chicago, Illinois. It became popular during the “corporate-culture-boom” of the early 1980’s (Alvesson, 2002, p. 6). Deal and Kennedy (1982) note that every organization has a culture. Whether weak or strong, culture has a powerful influence throughout an organization. They defined that “a strong culture is a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time” (p. 15). When culture is strong, all individuals know the goals of the organization, and they are working for them. Clear rules and well-defined objectives make employees feel confident about their work.

Business management literature suggests that culture is figural in establishing organizational strength. Cameron and Quinn (1999) explain that, “firms have capitalized on the power that resides in developing and managing a unique corporate culture. This power abides in the ability of a strong unique culture to reduce collective uncertainties” (p. 4). Organization leaders realize the necessity of understanding other cultures to enhance business relations.

Our understanding of the organizational culture and collaborative process is essential, particularly with regard to shedding new insights concerning team interoperational behavior. Knowledge in this area would be useful to help organizational members become more aware of one another similarities and differences, and hence contribute to more tolerance within the team. This is particularly important when the working environment focuses on acquisition or marketing of goods and services where cross-cultural parties must come together and undertake shared tasks.

B. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this thesis is to understand cross-cultural teams that form as a result of bringing together military and business personnel. Based upon a review of the literature, propositions are created applying current theory to this context. Examining

prior research, I move to expose potential risk areas for conflict among those working in mixed teams, as they engage in a shared business venture. This study will address the following questions:

- How do differences between military and business culture may detract from effective teamwork?
- What are the potential areas for conflict within cross-cultural teams?

C. PURPOSE

The purpose of this thesis is twofold. First, to extend our understanding of cross-cultural teamwork as demonstrated by a consideration of a shared task undertaken by military and business personnel. Second, to propose how conflicts may arise in a cross-cultural team situation. Since this research examines how conflicts can arise in the workplace, readers will benefit by gaining awareness of such problems, and by recognizing the impact of cultural differences in teamwork, which may help readers to eschew conflict.

D. SCOPE

This study does not attempt to develop theory on organizational culture; however, it applies current definitions and concepts about culture from present research, to extend prior work research with the propositions suggested for further investigation. I have prepared a literature review from research found in databases, case studies, and relevant publications to achieve the research purpose. This thesis seeks to understand military and business cultures as they come together, as exemplified by cross-cultural teams formed when these two types of organizations converge as they assume a shared task.

E. TERMS AND THEORY

Before discussing the theoretical framework it is important to define the terms.

1. Culture

The Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, (2003) defines culture as: “the integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief, and behavior that depends upon man’s capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations” or “the set of shared attitudes, values, and practices that characterize an institution or an organization” (p. 304).

An expert in organizational theory, Edgar Schein (1992), defines culture as, “what a group learns over a period of time as that group solves its problems of survival in an external environment and its problems of internal integration” (p. 12). An expert in anthropology and psychology, Theodore Schwartz, said: “Culture consists of the derivatives of experience, more or less organized, learned, or created by individuals of a population, including those images or encodements and their interpretations transmitted from past generations, from contemporaries, or formed by individuals themselves” (p. 17).

2. Teams

Teams have become important in today’s organizational culture, appearing in all kinds of workplace environments (Swain and Mills, 2003). Research on teams began in organizations in 1971 (Hare, 1992). The topic of teams primarily referred to studies in business and military activities. Some theorists have attempted to define teams and describe their work effort as “the ability to coordinate actions towards a common goal is at the core of what it means to be a team (Brannick and Prince, 1997, p. 3). Dyer elaborates, remarking that a teams is, “a collection of people who must collaborate, to some degree, to achieve common goals” (1987, p. 24). According to these definitions, the ability of teams to interact and to synchronize their actions adequately is an important issue. Typical for the military, teams exist that are required to train and to operate efficiently under high stress. An example is the crew of an Air Force bomber (B-17) during World War II. In this team, each individual had a set of assignments critical if the missions were to be accomplished.

3. Conflict

Rubin, Pruitt, and Kim (1994) established that “conflict means perceived divergence of interest or a belief that the parties’ current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously” (p. 5). Conflicts can be distinguished as the more basic differences between two or more parties, whereas a dispute is a particular issue over which one or more parties take actions (Ross, 1993, p. 17).

Theorists address conflicts in different ways. For example, some of them focus on behavior that creates conflict. Ross points out that culture is defined by “what people value and what they are likely to enter into disputes over, suggest appropriate ways to behave in particular kinds of disputes” (1993, p. 21). To address conflict, Brown (1983) suggests diagnosing conflicts with some techniques that include an examination of attitudes, behavior, and the cohesion of the group members.

Attitudes are defined as a learned and enduring tendency to perceive or act toward persons or situations in a particular way (Jary and Jary, 1991, p. 27). In one culture, behavior is relative to the environment and is derived from deep beliefs and from fundamental values (Baligh, 1994, p. 21). Cartwright asserted “historically the ‘tie that binds’ the groups has been cohesion, which has been defined as close knittedness or attraction of members for the group” (1968, p. 5)

F. METHODOLOGY

I provide the reader with a theoretical background on the subject prior to developing propositions as a starting point for extending research theory. The framework for this work includes outlining the definitions and concepts found in the literature. This information will be evaluated and analyzed to identify differences between the sectors and their organizational culture. Finally, propositions are set forth to suggest areas of risk; that is, areas where potential conflicts in cross-cultural teams, composed of military and business members, may unfold or arise.

G. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The thesis will be organized in the following manner:

Chapter II identifies military and business culture at the organizational level. The purpose of this chapter is to understand organizational life in the military and business organizations. The selection and acculturation process, organizational forms, and work life are examined in military and business organizations.

Chapter III examines team engagement, especially when the composition of the team is made up of employees from military and business organizations. An engineering design and development/venture team is regarded as being autonomous and fairly independent, and works with other teams of like-nature over a three-to-five year period

(Hare, 1992). An IPT fits this description. Behavioral and process elements, such as how time and responsibilities are managed, along with turnover, are assessed within IPTs. In so doing, I create propositions that describe and predict where friction or disagreements may rise among team members.

Chapter IV considers the propositions, limitations, and suggestions for future research. The goal is to summarize and reflect upon the potential risk areas for conflict that may reside in work environments where military and business cultures come together, as represented by mixed teams in a shared business venture.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

A. INTRODUCTION

The primary objective of this chapter is to compare the features that dominate the culture in military and business organizations. The goal is to understand the experience of members' organizational life more fully and to propose potential risk areas for conflict. Specifically, I examine areas where potential conflicts may arise between military and business members when they are engaged in work together. To understand organizational life, the following features are addressed in military and business organizations:

- Organizational culture
- Selection and acculturation process
- Work life
- Organizational forms

B. IMPORTANCE OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

The creation of sophisticated battle command-and-control systems, satellites, modern fighter planes, and precision-guidance munitions have further advanced military power, challenging even the most competent leader in the U.S. Armed Forces. This increased technology requires military organizational members to develop new skills, acquire additional knowledge, and form new work processes to accomplish their missions. It has also placed new obligations upon the military. These changes have motivated the research and study of the military organization.

An expert in international management and strategy, cross-cultural management, and business strategy, Jones defined organizational culture as “the set of shared values that control organizational members' interactions with each other and with suppliers, customers, and other people outside of the organization” (1995, p. 168). The organization's cultural values and underlying assumptions are present in an organization and represent how things are accomplished in that environment. Organizational culture has been studied by scholars to provide guidance for the corporation's leaders as there are strong links between culture and organizational performance. Cameron and Quinn

(1999) exposed that culture was long overlooked because it was taken for granted. Moreover, because culture was frequently undetectable. For the same reasons that scholars have studied organizational culture in private organizations, culture has also been studied in the military.

C. SELECTION AND ACCULTURATION PROCESS

1. Military

In military organizations, all potential candidates undergo a process that determines if they can satisfy the preliminary requirements to become members of the Armed Forces. The requirements for enlisted personnel to join the armed forces are different from those for becoming an officer. This work addresses only the requirements for individuals who want to be officers. Enlisted personnel comprise about 85 percent of the armed forces, and conduct the fundamental operations of the military in areas such as combat, administration, construction, engineering, health care, and human services. Officers, who comprise the remaining 15 percent of the Armed Forces, are the leaders of the military, supervising and managing activities in every occupational specialty of the Armed Forces.¹ Applicants, who want to be officers must meet the basic requirements for eligibility such as United States citizenship, be of good moral character, and between the ages of 17 and 23 in July of the year they enter a service academy. Military academies such as the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy require that all candidates pass the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT-I) or the American College Test (ACT) prior to admission. Candidates are then selected from those applicants with the highest scores. New candidates can also apply for nomination sources, which normally include U.S. Representatives, U.S. Senators, and the Vice President of the United States. Each member of Congress and the Vice President may have five nominated cadets for the different U.S. Military Academies.²

¹ Data obtained from the <<http://www.bls.gov/>> Department of Bureau of Labor Statistics. Accessed March 12, 2004.

² Information obtained from <<http://www.usma.edu/>> <www.usafa.af.mil/> <www.usna.edu/>, Accessed April 15, 2004.

Physical and medical conditions are assessed through the selection process and an interview is also conducted.³ With regard to the interview, several personal issues for joining the military are explored and the most common reasons for joining, as cited by military officers, are “educational benefits, patriotism, challenging work, and attraction to the military” (GAO, 2001, p. 18).

The number of applicants to the U.S. Naval Academy reached 40,000 the past year, of which only 4,000 candidates were eligible. Vice Admiral Rodney P. Rempt, active Superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy, said on March 26, 2004 that the institution is seeking highly motivated applicants who excel in academics as well as in leadership, athletics, and service.

A particular requirement of military leadership lies in the ability to motivate subordinates to do things which, viewed rationally, they might not desire to do (Miller, 2001). Leaders persuade individuals willingly to tolerate hardship and incur dangers, usually acute, that if left to their own devices they would do their utmost to avoid (Sheffield, 1997). That is, leadership is concerned with the inspiration and motivation of others. In addition to those concepts, leadership also serves as career guidance, which service members provide to their peers and subordinates.

Besides the U.S. Military Academies, officer training in the Armed Forces is also provided through the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC), a program offered at many colleges and universities, Officer Candidate Schools (OCS) or Officer Training Schools (OTS), the National Guard (State Officer Candidate School programs, the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences, and other programs.

Once personnel are admitted into the armed forces, they undergo a process of acculturation in which the prevailing values, customs, traditions, and beliefs are taught. The goal of this process is to cultivate a strong institutional identity because the driving imperative behind in U.S. military culture is the unique responsibility to fight and win the nation’s wars (CSIS, 2000). As previously mentioned, identity explains one means by which individuals act on behalf of the group or the organization (Albert, Blake, and

³ Data obtained from <<http://www.bls.gov/>> the Department of Bureau of Labor Statistics. Accessed March 12, 2004.

Dutton, 2000) and culture determine the identity of a human group (Hofstede, 1984). Specifically, the officer corps follows a sense of collective behavior as modeled by their process of acculturation. “This collective sense has its origins in the lengthy discipline and training necessary for professional competence, and the sharing of unique social responsibility” (Huntington, 2003, p. 10).

The acculturation process starts when the new members of the Armed Forces undergo basic training. Through courses in military skills and protocol, basic training provides a six-to-twelve week introduction to military life. Each day is carefully structured and includes demanding physical exercises designed to improve strength and endurance and to build unit cohesion. Over the years, members in the military share a common culture that consists of all the values and traditions that are passed along from generation to generation. Values are the conscious ideologies that guide and justify actions and behaviors (Ott, 1989). As Trainor suggests, “military values have been established over time and must be imparted to members through learning or socialization” (2000, p. 7), with obedience, integrity, discipline, selflessness, and loyalty as the most relevant military values (Bahr, 1990).

Military values are embedded within military traditions, which become rituals maintained over time. A worldwide example of a military tradition is the officer’s sword, which is regarded as a symbol of gentlemen and honor. Rituals, on the other hand, are the systematic and programmed routines of the day-to-day life in an organization (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Saluting (hand salute, sword salute, and gun salute), parades, change of command, and promotion ceremonies are just a few regular military rituals.

2. Business

“An industrial society should place all persons on jobs best suited to them” is a quote by Dunnette to describe the bedrock foundation, his view, of business culture (1966, p. 183). Here we see organizations as a centerpiece to where individuals can bring their personal competencies, knowledge, skills, abilities, and experiences to the workplace and a specific job role. Smith and Chan (1998) asserted that in a selection process of employees, organizations typically include an exam on general knowledge, a test of attitudes toward work, and interpersonal skills assessment upon hiring. Critical to

employment are references from former employees, education, specialized training, and personal interviews. In the interview process, companies follow different methods. In some companies, for example, interviews of new members of the technical or managerial staff are conducted. Management tends to look for characteristics such as intellect, emotional intelligence, motivation, and the ability to communicate. They also try to determine if the individual will fit in the established organizational culture. Thus, interviews have great significance in the private industry. Firms hire individuals from a variety of careers, but business people are generally expected to possess an academic background and work experience suitable to the requirements of a company and job task role. Even though many companies offer and encourage their personnel to continue their education, most do not hire personnel with limited basic education as demonstrated by the military. Corporate hiring selects professionals from a variety of specializations with marketable knowledge relevant to the industry (Trainor, 2000). When commencing a position in a business organization, the person starts their process of acculturation. This is a period where the employee begins to understand the organization and interact with other members. It is important to note that newcomers bring their own world view to the market place. This world view or one's social culture is characterized as very individualistic in the United States (Hofstede, 1984). Hofstede, a Professor Emeritus of Organizational Anthropology and International Management at Maastricht University, examined the characteristics that define cultures. In general, he found that individualistic cultures are characterized by the following: (1) individualist cultures tend to stress leadership and variety; and (2) managers tend to disagree with the statements that a good leader should give detailed instructions and only information necessary for their intermediate tasks.

When comparing military and business organizations, it is essential to understand how organizations build their cultural bases by how they recruit, select, and train new personnel. The comparisons between military and business co-workers are necessary to understand the organizational life of the military and business organizations. In conclusion, the selection and acculturation process in military and business organizations maintain relevant differences. These are related to the requirements and expectancies

that the organizations have to attract personnel and to create organizational membership that fit with the exiting organization culture. For the military organization, early processes facilitate the process of acculturation toward a more collective orientation and culture. For the business organization, areas of expertise vary resulting in a heterogeneous group with different values and compose a typically more individualistic culture, especially in the West.

Table 1. Comparing Military and Business Selection Process.

Military Culture	Business Culture
Candidates are selected with basic educational requirements.	Candidates are selected from a variety of specializations.
Candidates are selected from military academies and programs only (e.g., ROTC, OCS, OTS).	Candidates originate from a wide variety of sources and backgrounds.
Requirements are based on age, physical conditions, health, athletic abilities, leadership, and good morale.	Requirements are based on personal competences, knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience for the job or position.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The selection criterion in the military culture supports homogeneous requirements and backgrounds, while the business culture supports heterogeneous requirements and backgrounds. 	

Table 2. Comparing Military and Business Acculturation Process.

Military Culture	Business Culture
Strong process of acculturation at the beginning.	Gradual process of acculturation.
Intense initial training to insert members quickly into the system.	Less intense training to insert member into the system.
Strong institutional identity is enforced by values, traditions, and rituals.	Institutional identity is crafted to following the organization's philosophy and style.
The process is aimed toward a collective culture with values such as selflessness, loyalty, and obedience.	The process follows an individualistic approach.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Military members find it difficult to identify with their civilian counterparts who lack a strong collective culture and identity. ▪ Business members may feel rejected by their military counterparts when they cannot fully comply with collective values such as selflessness and discipline. 	
Proposition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conflicts may arise when military members perceive less collaborative efforts from business members. ▪ Conflicts may arise if business members are expected to abide to a more collective culture. 	

D. WORK LIFE

1. Military

Moskos, a Professor at the University of California-Los Angeles whose areas of interests include military sociology and race/ethnic/minority relations, defined the terms *institution* and *occupation* in his book *The Military*. According to his work (1988), an institution is “legitimated in terms of values and norms transcending individual self-interest in favor of a presumed higher good” (p. 16). An occupation, on the other hand, is “legitimated in terms of the market place” (p. 16). If the occupational orientation prevails, individuals will strive for market wages. In the military, one’s profession transcends the specific job occupied (Tweeddale, 1986). A military career tends to be more than “just another job” (Soeters, 2000) Thus, as the institutional orientation dominates, such matters as leisure time, family issues, and (high) salary are relatively insignificant (Soeters, 2000). Because of the tendency toward institutional orientation,

service members plan to be in the military for a long time, regardless of the opportunities offered by the labor market. The GAO (1986) reported “that the reasons to join the military and to serve for long time (20 years) are related” (p. 17). For example, of the 66 percent of officers who entered the military to serve their country, only 34 percent expressed their desire to leave duty before reaching 20 years. On the other hand, of the 46 percent of officers who entered the military for a specific job, 54 percent expressed their desire to leave the military before reaching 20 years.

To summarize, the military’s culture tends to lean toward the promoted institutional characteristics, including self-sacrifice, liability for 24-hour service, and limitations for seeking better work conditions or employee preferences.

2. Business

In comparison with the military culture, business culture tends to have an occupational orientation. The civilian employees are regularly tied to a specific activity or career field (Tweedale, 1986). As mentioned, an occupation is legitimated in terms of the marketplace. In most situations, employees have participation in negotiating wages and work conditions. From this standpoint, the likelihood of turnover is higher in civil firms than in military organizations. As such, there is concern that other aspects of the organization become more fully integrated, with benefits to support employees’ work life as well as family’s needs. Upper Management knows the cost of turnover is high, especially with regard to recruiting and training. Progressive companies thus seek to improve members’ work life perspective to reduce turnover. Leaders and managers of such companies are aware that improving work life can translate into shareholder benefits. The Ford Foundation pointed out, “Addressing work/family concerns as legitimate and systematic issues for a corporation can lead to innovation in work practices that not only help employees, but also improve the bottom-line results for the company” (Collins and Porras, 1994, p. 84).

Scholars support these claims, such as Schein (1992), who indicated that family issues must be taken seriously in corporations. Contrary to military organizations, firms try to take into account the feelings and preferences of their employees. In many cases, employees are allowed to make choices when a new job is offered. This condition is not offered to military members.

Table 3. Comparing Military and Business Work Life

Military Culture	Business Culture
Members tend to stay in the organization for longer time, regardless of better wages and conditions of work in the marketplace, because military work transcends the job role.	Members tend to stay in the organization whether wages and work conditions satisfy their expectative. Hence, if those conditions are not mat, they can leave the organization.
Members take on multiple job roles and gain experience in different fields.	Members are more frequently tied to specific job roles within their field.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Because the military profession transcends the job occupied while the business profession is occupational-oriented, military members may find difficulty understanding their counterparts' priorities when tasks and schedules are set. ▪ Business members may perceive that military members are not well-specialized in a specific task assignment due to their rotation among different jobs. 	
Proposition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Military members may find difficulties in trying to reach consensus with individuals who prioritize individual interest rather than the interests of the employing organization. ▪ Business members may have less trust in their military counterparts' expertise and knowledge in jobs requiring long term occupation. 	

E. HIERARCHY

1. Military

The hierarchical culture values stability and control, and emphasizes formal coordination, centralized decision making, and vertical communication (Goodman, Zammuto and Gifford, 2003). Hierarchy describes the bureaucratic character of the military life (Soeters, 2000). Military organizations are pyramidal structures, reflecting

authority and status derived from sources other than the supervision of subordinates. This culture is very convenient for performing routine or simple tasks (Carley, 1992). In military organizations, the hierarchical culture is based on the authority of rank. Thus, decisions are vested from the top (higher rank of authority in military units) to those with lower rank and authority. The hierarchical culture is characterized by a set of decision makers that are organized in a chain of command (Cohen, 1986). These forms of hierarchical organization uses standardized procedures, which are established in plans, manuals, and directives. Such documents provide a framework so that in the military, service members perform their job according to rules and procedures with consistency. Cameron and Quinn (1999) present a framework on “the organizational culture profile” explaining that in the hierarchy culture “the leaders pride themselves on being good coordinators and organizers who are efficiency-minded” (p. 204). This concept fits military leaders very well because they must be in compliance with the rules and standards that control the military organization.

Recalling the bureaucratic term and knowing its classic attributes such as rules, specialization, hierarchy, and accountability (Weber, 1947), the bureaucratic character of the military life, has two sides, the cold and the hot side (Souters, 2000). Seen from the cold side, military organizations are managed bureaucratically reflected in the paperwork, planning, and the budget that are necessary to satisfy laws, policies and regulations. During this period, responsibility, knowledge, and duty are strengthened. The hot side refers to the combat units engaged in military operations such as battles, crisis, or disasters. As noted, the hierarchical culture is maintained even though new ideas are implemented in concordance with technological advances.

2. Business

Paul S. Adler, a professor at the Marshall School of Business of the University of Southern California, discussed in his book *The Knowledge Economy and Future Capitalism* (2001). Here he describes the market/price and hierarchy/authority as forms of organizations. Market and hierarchy forms have long been viewed as alternative mechanisms for allocating resources (Coase, 1937). Under this premise, organizations apply control mechanisms allowing certain authority to direct resources that will result in

reducing costs. This frequently occurs in a firm when internal transactions take place. Adler noted that the hierarchy form relies on the authority mechanism, which is necessary to create and to coordinate the division of labor. These concepts apply to both business and military organizations. Regarding the military, the hierarchy form fits very well due to the nature of routine tasks. Here decisions are made at high-levels and supported by detailed documentation. In contrast, private organizations find it difficult to perform innovative tasks under hierarchical structures (Scott, 1992; Draft, 1998). The market form, in contrast with hierarchical form, provide more effective communication (Galbraith, 1973; Simon, 1973) and more decentralized action (Williamson, 1975), necessary for many businesses to sustain their survival and livelihood.

While the military culture maintains its hierarchical culture, business organizations today are shifting from a relatively complacent hierarchy culture to a culture driven by customer focus such as a market, clan, or adhocracy culture (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Adhocracy is an organizational form that recently emerged. The adhocracy culture is “the most responsive to the hyperturbulent, hyperaccelariting conditions that increasingly typify the organizational world of the twenty –first century” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 38). Corporations such as aerospace, software development, and filmmaking employ this organizational form to produce innovative products and to adapt to rapid changes in the market.

F. MARKET

1. Military

The Department of Defense (DoD) supports the acquisition of goods and services from a wide variety of sources. The DoD must satisfy legal procedures to be in compliance with all the required laws. The bureaucratic feature of the acquisition process is necessary to achieve readiness, interoperability, and combat effectiveness of the armed forces. Interoperability is an element relevant in the evolution of the acquisition system which defines the ability to communicate with each other and share information, to meet the operational goals of coalition and joint warfare (Criscimagna, 2003). With improved interoperability, the military services quickly adopt new technology, lower costs for weapon system, and facilitate more effective joint operations.

Table 4. Comparing Military and Business Hierarchical Forms.

Military Culture	Business Culture
Hierarchical form fits well with the implementation of the routine tasks of the organization.	Hierarchical form does not fit well with non-routinely tasks (e.g., new product development).
Tendency toward a more centralized decision-making process.	Tendency toward a more decentralized decision-making process.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Business personnel may perceive a lack of, or little, decision-making power in military members due to the centralized process present in their organization. ▪ Business representatives may find difficulties to manage changes and innovations in the development of complex tasks due to the hierarchical culture of their military counterparts. 	
Proposition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conflicts may arise when business members feel frustrated because of the centralized decision-making process of their military counterparts. ▪ Conflicts may occur when business members experience contrast managing innovations in the development of complex tasks under the hierarchical culture of their military counterparts. 	

The DoD acquisition system has evolved in business and planning practices to become more adept to policies in the current market. Integrated Products Teams, as mentioned previously, are cross-functional teams that are formed to deliver a product. IPTs are examples of new and modern practices implemented in the DoD. Despite the progress achieved, the DoD maintains centralization of the decision-making process as a consequence of its hierarchical culture. Cameron and Quinn (1999) asserted that the hierarchical structure is a very formalized and structured place to work. The long-term concern is for stability and performance, and military members are especially concerned with task related elements of accountability, reliability, and predicable results. Contrary to market culture, the hierarchical culture found in the military is focused on internal affairs with centralized decision-making, and its long-term focus and orientation is on oriented to stability and performance.

2. Business

Paul Adler (2001), states that “the market form relies on the price mechanism to coordinate between suppliers and anonymous buyer” (p. 216). Firms make decisions based upon preferences and limitations to maximize their benefits. “The key feature of a market is that it claims to be a mechanism that secures economic order and the coordination of economic activities without any conscious center that directs it” (Thomson, 2003, p. 24). Here we see that the decision-making process is based upon price mechanisms and competitive agents, involving free choices. Information is gathered to make decisions, however, no one exercises control in an open market. Other theorists refer to the market form as oriented to the external environment instead of internal affairs (Willimason, 1975; Ouchi, 1981). That means organizations are mainly focused on transactions with external entities such as contractors, customers, and suppliers. In the market culture, people are competitive and goal-oriented, with the long-term focus on competitive actions and achievement of measurable goals” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 204).

G. SUMMARY

Based upon my evaluation of the literature, I now review the propositions presented.

Since service members possess a strong military culture and identification with the military profession, they find it difficult to identify with civilian counterparts who lack the same culture and identity as their organization. Thus, conflicts may arise when military members perceive less collaborative efforts from business members who may act in a more individualistic manner. Conversely, this same tension may emerge if business members are expected to abide to a more collective culture characterized by the military organization, when both groups are involved in a shared task. That is, business members may feel rejected by their military counterparts when they cannot fully comply with values such as loyalty and discipline.

Table 5. Comparing Military and Business Market Form

Military Culture	Business Culture
Members are concerned with task related elements of accountability, reliability, and predictable results. .	Members are concerned with competitiveness and they are goal-oriented.
In the long term, the organization is focused on stability and performance.	In the long term, the institution is focused on competitiveness, actions, and the achievement of measurable goals.
Even though the organization has evolved toward market practices (e.g., IPDD, IPTs) it still maintains its hierarchical form.	Firms can shift to other organizational forms such as market and adhocracy, adapting to new organizational trends.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Military members tend to seek hierarchical-driven processes while business members make decisions based on the opportunities that the market offers. That is, business personnel are concerned about decisions that allow them to maintain their profitability, product quality, and competitiveness. 	
Proposition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conflict is likely to arise in teams when military members recognize norms of bureaucracy and business members follow norms of decentralization. ▪ Military and business members could have conflicting views on the ways that a mission can be accomplished because they each have different perspectives based on their respective organizational objectives. 	

Comparing work life in both military and business, two opposing characteristics are established. First, there is a general transcendence of a prescribed job occupied by military members versus an occupational-oriented profession by organizational members in business. Military members may find difficulties in reaching a consensus with individuals who prioritize individual interests rather than the interests of the employing organization. Another second cause of potential conflict may rise from military members being exposed to frequent permanent change of station (PCS). That may raise difficulties in business members establishing trust in their military counterparts' expertise and adequate knowledge in determined areas and jobs.

Because of the hierarchical culture of the military organization, which is rich in procedures and regulations, conflict may arise when negotiations take place between the two sectors. Civilians may be frustrated by the centralized decision-making process of

their military counterparts, which can frequently cause delays. In addition, the hierarchical culture is adequate for the implementation of routine tasks, but problematic when moving to implement non-routinely tasks. Business members may then encounter resistance when innovative approaches or solutions emerge during shared tasks.

The bureaucratic character of the military organization may conflict with the decentralized practices implemented in the traditional market sector. While business members are concerned about quality and profitability to sustain their competitive edge, military members are concerned about performance and accountability, while they must comply with laws and regulations. Because of these different operating assumptions, military and business members may have conflicting views on the ways that a mission can be accomplished because of their alternative perspectives.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. TEAMS

A. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to examine team engagement when composed of employees from military and business organizations. I focus on an engineering design and development/venture team, such as an IPT. Behavioral and process elements of the team engagement, such as responsibilities, turnover, leadership, and cohesiveness, are examined.

When teams or groups are formed to undertake specific tasks, they establish a working relationship based on diverse backgrounds. Such groups or teams are composed of individuals who bring their own cultures and insights to the tasks and issues under consideration. “In many cases, the term team is used as a synonym for group” (Kanter, 1983 p. 18). The term team, however, seems to be reserved for more complex tasks that require coordination, expertise, and more differentiated roles within its members (Hare, 1992). When new members join in a team, they often adopt the team’s patterns of behaving and thinking (Coghlan, 1994). “Complex tasks contain more distinct acts and information cues that require more coordination, and are more susceptible to changes in the process” (Man and Lam, 2003, p. 4). In short, teams that execute complex tasks require great assistance from other functional areas to perform their jobs.

Developing new products or improving current products is a very complex task that requires the collaboration of personnel from different functional areas that may include: engineering, manufacturing, contracting, and other departments, as well as customers. Teams are used in the industry to develop new products. These types of teams are called cross-functional teams. Clark, Amundson, and Cardy (2003) defined the cross-functional team as “a group comprised of individuals from separate functional areas convened with a specific purpose for a defined period of time” (p. 219). Similarly to industry and/or business organizations, the military organizations use cross-functional teams known as IPTs to develop and procure weapon systems. In so doing, these cross-functional teams require the involvement and effective collaboration of all members, both

military and business personnel. To understand these factors, I examine behavioral and process elements such as management of responsibilities, along with turnover, leadership, and cohesiveness between the two types of organizations.

B. BACKGROUND ON CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAMS

Cross-functional teams are used to achieve complex tasks. These working teams receive different names in both military and business organizations. The military organizations use the term Integrated Product Teams (IPTs), while the business organizations use the term New Product Development (NPD). However, they both accomplish essentially the same tasks. Each team is essentially in place to deliver a new or improved product to an external or internal customer or user. In theory, members of cross-functional teams work harmoniously and productively to develop, procure or support a given product or product line. To accomplish the team's objective, members must be organized to manage the team's various responsibilities. Those responsibilities are comparable for both cross-functional teams in the military and the business organizations.

In an ideal situation, team members have open discussions, with no secrets, to facilitate the development of products and the organization of tasks. This type of communication is also helpful so that disagreements can be broached and solved early. "Issues that cannot be resolved by the team must be identified early so that resolution can be achieved as quickly as possible at the appropriate level."⁴

Team members themselves, through their personal interactions and their connections to functional areas, are the agent of exchange (Clark, Amundson, and Cardy, 2003). When this responsibility is achieved, representatives are able to solve differences early and also provide feedback to improve processes and procedures. Hence, an increased understanding of knowledge in teams could improve their ability to meet a wide variety of organizational demands (Cohen and Bailey, 1997). Knowledge must be distributed to team members because there is rarely any one individual who possesses all that is known to that collective entity (Anand, Clark and Zellmer, 2003). Team

⁴ Information extracted from SEDEF May 10, 1995.

representatives may learn from one another's expertise by interacting and sharing the individual or external knowledge to support the team's goal. This responsibility of team development provides landmarks for empowerment (Swenson and Bradford, 1997).

Empowerment is an element that allows representatives to speak on behalf of their superiors. That responsibility depends upon members' level of knowledge and skills. Morhan, Cohen, and Mohrman (1995) defined empowerment as "the capability to make a difference in the attainment of individual, team, and organizational goals." In cross-functional teams, empowerment is a function and responsibility for having the authority, resources, and accountability to achieve a mission (Fisher, 1993). In this type of team, representatives must be responsible for revising and adjusting their own processes and procedures. An empowered team has increased task motivation as a result of an individual's positive attitude and orientation to his or her job (Spreitzer, 1995). These actions require support from the top level.

The literature review suggests that in order to gain cross-functional benefits, the team's cultural differences must be addressed (Bartunek, 1996; Schreiber, 1996). Even though responsibilities in teams are well defined, cultural characteristics could prevent team members from giving their best to support their effective engagement.

C. TURNOVER

When people leave, in either form or type of organization without mechanisms for transferring their personal expertise and experience among decision makers, the lessons of the history are lost, knowledge disappears, and the institution memory is reduced (Carroll 1984; Neustadt and May, 1986). Collaboration and experience enables individuals to learn from each other and to obtain mutual benefits that they could not achieve independently. Such benefits may be identified as ideas and expertise from knowledgeable members who collaborate in technological activities. This collaboration or mutual benefit is vulnerable, however, due to labor turnover (Dodgson, 1993). With the idea of learning between members, B. Lundvall (1998) defined the term "learning by interacting" as individuals who gain advantages by close cooperation. Learning-storage is inculcated into individual organization memory (Clark, Amundson and Cardy, 2003). When turnover occurs, the organization loses expertise and experience (Carley, 1992).

For individuals, experience is expected to lead to improved performance and engage a high percentage of “correct” decisions (Carley, 1992). Turnover affects the balance and location of experience in the organization. Turnover should also impact the organization’s ability to learn and to perform (Carley, 1992). In a study of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), turnover was considered a cause of instability and uncertainty (GAO report, 1996). The average tenure of FAA administrators and senior acquisition executives contributed to delays in reaching decisions and contributed to schedule and cost problems in the organization (GAO Report, 1996).

Turnover can also have positive effects. Even though the organization pursues new members hiring similar profiling from previous members, selection procedures are notoriously ineffective as screening devices (Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1975). This point notwithstanding, new members may turn out to be primary sources for organizational variety (Cambell, 1965). In this event, turnover is a crucial long-term source of adaptation and evolutionary organizational development; variety increases the chances of survival. Turnover can also have a positive effect on membership attitudes (Staw, 1980). If undesirable members leave the organization this turn of events can lead to some members having an improved attitude (Guest, 1962).

Turnover has similar effects in military and business teams. Both organizations suffer when organizational learning and memory are lost. The positive effects, on the other hand, may differ, especially with regards to the renewal of groups or teams with a variety of professionals, as present in business or military teamwork.

D. COHESIVENESS

Cartwright (1968), an associate professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan has authored numerous articles on social attitudes and the quantification of group behavior. He defined cohesion as the close knittedness or allure of members of a group. Other scholars have noted that “Social cohesion is the integration of group behavior as a result of social bonds, attractions, or other forces that hold members of a group in interaction over a period of time” (Jary and Jary, 1991, p. 449).

1. Military

Hauser, a military scholar defined cohesiveness as “the ability of a military unit to hold together, to sustain combat effectiveness despite the stresses of the battlefield” (1979, p. 23). Hauser pointed out that in the military units cohesiveness is reinforced by a sense of identification with the unit—squad, platoon, company, and battalion. That is, members of groups can identify the similar values, attitudes, and interests that help them to build cohesion. Several authors agree that it is improbable to achieve high performance without a sufficient level of team cohesion (Hoegl, 1998; Mullen and Cupper, 1994; Helfert, 1998). In the case of military teams, there is a high probability of team cohesiveness because of the homogeneity of the cultural characteristics of their members. Besides similar cultural characteristics, cohesiveness is reinforced in military teams when they face external treats. Stein (1976) pointed out that another factor that increases the degree of team cohesiveness is the existence of an external threat. For this reason, when a group or military team is under stress due to an outside force, team members face the threat together and become more cohesive than usual.

When group cohesiveness is high, all the members express solidarity, mutual liking, and positive feelings about conducting the tasks of the group (Janis, 1972). Group decisions have often been seen as offering the benefit of collective wisdom, but may also lead to disastrous results (Raven, 1998). Irving Janis (1972) created the term Groupthink, which addressed different symptoms such as excessive optimism that encourages taking extreme risks and judgments assumed unanimously. He defined groupthink as “a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members’ striving for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action” (p. 9). Janis also asserted that one of the conditions which support groupthink is the docility fostered by the suave attitude of the leader that encourages the group’s submissiveness and uncritical acceptance of the issue under consideration. Irving additionally cites examples of groupthink “fiascoes” such as the Bay of Pigs invasion and the escalation of the Vietnam War. Excessive cohesion in groups cause members to disregard all alternatives and seek to maintain unanimity.

2. Business

Previously, mentioned in the review of business culture, was the notion that diversity of background and expertise is varied among individuals. These heterogeneous characteristics lead to different values and attitudes within a team. Such diversity is critical and plays a role in cross-functional teams. It can lead to difficulties, however, because people hold biases toward one another (Rajesh, Smith and Park, 2001). When a cross-functional team is not fully cohesive, the resulting innovative outcome can be influenced. The literature and research suggest that for an outcome to be innovative it must be novel and appropriate (Amabile, 1983; Jackson and Messick, 1965). Appropriateness referred as the extent to which a given output is viewed as useful to some audience (Jackson and Messick, 1965). Innovativeness requires that individuals have a desire to share ideas and expertise to benefit the team. This is only possible if team members have the desire, even a need, to belong to the team. If these conditions are present, individuals will probably have a greater likelihood of achieving innovative outcomes.

In a cross-functional team composed by military and business personnel it is important to take into account that they do not share analogous cultural characteristics. They form one heterogeneous group. This suggests they may not feel great attraction toward each other, at the onset. Hence, there is a constant challenge presented to the team as they try to establish togetherness and collaboration in pursuit of a team goal.

Table 6. Comparing Military and Business Cohesiveness

Military Culture	Business Culture
High probability of team cohesiveness because of homogeneous cultural characteristics.	Lower probability of team cohesiveness because of heterogeneous cultural characteristics.
Fails to consider all alternatives, seeking to maintain unanimity because of excessive team cohesiveness.	There is a greater possibility of considering all the alternatives when issues are discussed because of the lower probability of team cohesiveness.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Because of their culture differences, military and business personnel may not feel great attraction toward working each other. ▪ Business members may feel that the sense of cohesiveness in military members limits the courses of actions and alternatives to solve team issues. 	
Proposition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conflicts may occur when military and business team members have low cohesiveness, which may then affect the team's goal. ▪ When excessive cohesiveness dominates a team, conflictive situations may arise if all alternatives and courses of action are not discussed. 	

E. LEADERSHIP

A vast literature exists that addresses a variety of definitions on leadership: However, for the purpose of this study, I will focus on the definitions of leadership according to John P. Kotter, Professor of Leadership at the Harvard Business School and author of different books and articles over the past thirty years. Kotter asserted that “leadership defines what the culture should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles” (1996, p. 26). Kotter drew three leadership distinctions. These are:

- Motivating and inspiring: energizing people to overcome major political and resources barriers to change by satisfying basic, but often human, needs.
- Aligning people: communicating direction in words and deeds to all those cooperating may be needed so as to influence the creation of teams and coalitions that understand the vision and strategies and that accept their validity.

- Establishing direction: developing a vision of the future –often the distant future– and strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve that vision.

1. Military

Kotter's definitions are used to fit the leadership style of the military organization according to other authors, who have contributed to the military leadership subject. It is essential to know that military leadership is mainly addressed on the values that leaders must show on the battlefield.

Referring to the quote of Miller, “a particular requirement of military leadership lies in the ability to motivate subordinates to do things, which viewed rationally they might not desire to do” (2001). It is necessary, as such, for military leaders to use a variety of symbolic behaviors to gain followers, including self-denial and self-sacrifice by firm actions, and their verbal commitment must transcend values (Buck and Corb, 1981). In combat, leaders must motivate soldiers to do difficult things and, in peace, motivation to perform with excellence is important (Taylor and Rosenbach, 2000). Doctor Lewis Sorley (1979), a graduate of West Point and specialist in institutional ethics and policy information, pointed out that a leader as practicing manager has the central role to elicit the willing best effort of these subordinates. All of them agree that leadership is concerned with motivation and inspiration.

An assistant professor at Thomson State University and former soldier, Professor John Faris (1977), defined leadership as communication, which elicits voluntary actions among peers and subordinates. To elicit voluntary actions or to influence others depends upon the military leaders' ability to share ideas and to communicate (Taylor and Rosenbach, 2000). Those authors pointed out that good leadership is marked by a congruency over time between actions and words resulting in the ability to influence others. Thus, leadership results when leader head causes the members to accept his directive and to cooperate toward group goals (Taylor and Rosenberg, 1984). Those affirmations are tied in with Kotter's leadership distinction: aligning people.

Providing direction requires that leaders have a clear vision of what must be done, what is necessary to get the job done and how to proceed (Taylor and Rosenberg, 2000).

Leaders are not visionary due to their position and rank, but based upon their ability to look into the future and move their organizations toward clearly defined goals (Halstead, 1981). In order to complete the job well done and to diminish casualties, leaders must make decisions under uncertainty. That uncertainty involves the acceptance of risks (Tanner, 1997). Even though all men and women in uniform are prepared to take loss of life or casualties, there is an excessive aversion to encounter such extremes in the political world. This is reflected to a greater extent among politicians, even more so than the public at large (CSIS, 2000). To reduce risk, officers must anticipate and manage risk by planning and make risk decisions at the right level (Tanner, 1997).

The military organization is dominated by hierarchical culture. Its members, thus, reflect leadership values such as loyalty, integrity, discipline, and selflessness (Bahr, 1990). As noted by Faris from a variety of research of World War, he found there is not a conclusive model of the will to combat. Nevertheless, he noted that there is a general model of peer cohesion (horizontal) which is articulated with the military hierarchy (vertical) through leadership (Faris, 1977). Nye (1999) notes that the military's leadership was instrumental in changing public perception from the image gained during the Vietnam War to a professional force that performed credibly in the Gulf War. A key concern is the ability of military members to adopt their culture according to changing demands. This concern about changes in military leadership is encouraged in IPTs. Whether a team is an IPT or not, teams require effective leadership if they are to be successful.

A current tendency is to adapt the traditional military leadership to a more businesslike approach. The concept of IPTs is an example of that trend, however, with regard to the purpose of this study, the traditional leadership characteristics of military members are used to comparing them with their business counterparts.

2. Business

Following the same approach used to study military leadership according to Kotter's definitions, business leadership will be addressed. In a market culture, team leaders tend to be hard-driving competitors and producers, while in an adhocracy culture, team leaders are innovators, entrepreneurs, and visionaries.

“In the business organizations, leadership is a relation of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders” (Burn, 1962). Influence over others will be high when a leader has staff, and requires their support to lead the shared efforts. Business leaders have personal responsibility for developing their staff and ensuring they are prepared for workplace engagement, including accomplishment of their job or tasks assignments as well as to learn and to contribute to organizational change (Manning and Robinson, 2002).

A great deal of management literature focuses on business leadership as being successful at being change agents as a major function of their role. Bass and Avolio (1995) built their model of transformational leadership around similar behavioral components as Kotter did: charisma or idealized influence and inspiration. They defined a model of transformational leader as the notion that these leaders are able to motivate to performance levels that exceed their own and their leaders’ expectations to support the firm’s goals. Charisma is defined in terms of both the leader’s behavior (such as articulating a mission) and the leader to influence the followers’ reactions (such as trust in the leader’s ability). Bass argues, “Charisma is a necessary ingredient to transformational leadership, but by itself is not sufficient to account for the transformational process” (1985, p.31). Bennis (1994) identifies leaders’ characteristics such as ability to guide vision, passion (e.g., vocation, profession, courses of action), integrity (e.g., self knowledge, candor, and maturity), trust, curiosity and daring (e.g., willing to learn and to take risk).

Leadership plays an important role aligning people with not only the strategic initiatives of the organization but also the behaviors and values of followers so that they focus on the company’s goals (Conger and Nakungo, 1998). Another behavioral component of Bass and Avolio’s model of transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation. This concerns the leader’s provision of a flow of new ideas and perspectives that challenges followers to rethink in old practices of achieving tasks (Conger and Kanguro, 1998). In this case, the leader’s task is to support followers, assisting their development by promoting growth opportunities, and to respect them as individuals. Other writers have implicated leadership as a critical issue in the innovative process, but

such accounts have mainly focused on the need for participative or collaborative leadership styles (Kanter, 1983; Pelz and Andrews, 1966). In short, aligning people to build follower self-confidence.

Leadership is a matter of inducing common orientation and direction with the company and of loyalty toward its goals. This includes a leader's ability to achieve social cohesion in groups, teams, or with outsiders (Alvesson, 2002). Adler asserted that "within firms, leadership seems to have shifted toward a form of trust of fact-based management, independent inquiry, and collaborative problem-solving rather than traditionalist deference to established hierarchy" (2001, p. 227). In establishing direction, Kotter pointed out the importance of developing a vision for the future. That important component goes beyond the leader's role in communicating a compelling vision. This includes the support at all levels, promoting team work with people participating and communicating in two-way communication, promoting self-confidence, being aware of weakness (Manning and Robertson, 2002).

The essential difference between military leaders and business leaders, when they are compared, lies in their "response relations" namely the motivational base (Taylor and Rosenbanch. 1984). They asserted that in combat units, unlike business organizations, there is an additional element; the possibility of death. Military leaders must motivate and inspire peers and subordinates to sacrifice for their country (Buck and Korb, 1981). Leaders in combat unit thus have a powerful affective function and response to a professional leadership process, which results in the image and role of the military leader as a paternalistic figure. Hence, the job and motivational basis leads to different styles of leadership. There is a popular stereotype throughout society that military leaders are more authoritative than those in the civilian organizations (Buck and Korb, 1981). Scholars argue that there exist good reasons for this (Pech and Durden, 2003), as military leaders are rooted in their military culture that requires strict attendance to obedience to orders, discipline, and personal sacrifice.

The bottom-line in comparing leadership in military and business organizations lies in the nature of the mission of each organization. Military leaders arouse emotions in their people to act beyond the framework of providing efforts expecting compensations.

That means, leaders who arouse emotions may be sometimes so powerful that peers and subordinates are willing to sacrifice their lives for their country. For this reason, military leaders have a powerful affective function and response to a professional leadership process as noted by Taylor and Rosenberg. With regard to the stereotypical view of the military, it still holds that commanders are autocratically making decisions and barking orders to subordinates in response to the chaotic scenery on the battlefield (Pech and Durden, 2003).

In business organizations, on the other hand, motivation and inspiration is also related to pursuing the firms' goals. That is, everything is conducted by doing business and making profits. In contrast with military leaders, business leadership approaches is focused upon a more collaborative and participative style. This trend support innovativeness in teams as a critical element to take into account in firms.

F. SUMMARY

Since military members form a homogeneous group due to similar cultural characteristics in contrast with the heterogeneous business group, conflicts may occur when cohesion in military and business teams is too weak to sustain cohesion, which may adversely affect the team's goal. On the other hand, when excessive cohesiveness dominates a team; conflictive situations may arise if all alternative and course of actions in the team have not been addressed.

Turnover has similar effects on military and business teams. Both organizations suffer when learning and memories are lost. If turnover is considered in cross-functional teams composed of military and business members, the mutual benefits of learning from one another is interrupted. That may be a cause of instability and uncertainty in the achievement of the team's goals. Positive effects of turnover also are pointed in this work-study and these differ about the renewal of groups or teams with a variety of professionals. This variety of professionals occurs mainly in business organizations due their selection process, which is a source of adaptation and evolutionary organizational development. Even though turnover does not seem to be a cause of conflict between team members, it is a critical constraint to be taken into account for its possible impact on the team's ability to learn and perform.

Table 7. Comparing Military and Business Leadership

Military Culture	Business Culture
Motivate and inspire peers and subordinate to act in dangerous situations to support the group and team's goals (e.g., actions on the battlefield).	Motive and inspire others to support the firm goals (e.g., profits, competitiveness).
Obtain obedience from peers and subordinates.	Obtain participation, collaboration, and integration from members.
Risk Adverse.	Risk-taking.
Considered autocratic by outsiders.	Considered collaborative and participative by outsiders.
Values mainly promoted: integrity, sacrifice, loyalty, discipline, and obedience.	Values promoted: guide vision, passion, integrity, trust, curiosity, participation, collaboration, and respect for individual attitudes.
Implications	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Business members may perceive that their military counterparts are reluctant to take business risks when results are not predictable. ▪ Military members may dominate teamwork due to their propensity to take command and provide their leadership's characteristics limiting the participation of all members in developing team leadership in a more shared fashion. 	
Proposition	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conflicts may arise when military members are not confident to take risks on situations that have not been sufficiently considered in initial plans. ▪ Conflicts are likely to occur between military and business members when military leaders limit the participation of business team members. 	

When military and business members form a cross-functional team, conflicts may occur as a result of different leadership styles. Specifically, military members as a more autocratic style tend to usurp authority, creating tension and potential aversion on team members.

Conflict may arise when military members are not confident enough to take risks in situations that have not been sufficiently considered in their initial plans.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. CONCLUSIONS

A. SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

Based upon the purpose of this thesis, potential areas for conflict between the military and business members in the organizational culture and cross-functional teams are identified. Propositions were created for the sole purpose of extending current knowledge of the impact of the cultural differences upon cross-functional teams comprised of military and business personnel. Based upon the review of the literature; however, two areas which were considered in the content of this study but not addressed with propositions, were selection process and turnover. The reason why they were discussed is because they are highly relevant to the development of organizational culture. That said, the first area, selection process is not considered conflictive because newcomers need time to be trained and prepared to assume major responsibilities within the respective organizations. Even if differences in the criteria result in evaluating all potential candidates to be admitted either in the military or in business organizations, it still is not considered a particularly volatile area, or one for potential risk or conflict.. Nevertheless, the comparisons in regard with the selection processes are necessary to understand the organizational life of the military and business organizations. The second area, turnover, may affect indistinctly both organizational teams in similar ways. If a military or business member leaves the team, it may be detrimental to teamwork. Thus, turnover remains as an important constraint to be considered in cross-functional teams. Finally, I move to show readers the end result of this research. These potential areas for conflict are all not inclusive neither are they conclusive. Consequently, the findings in the following tables are established within the framework of this research.

Table 8. Organizational Culture Propositions

Potential Risk Areas for Conflicts	Propositions
Acculturation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts may arise when military members perceive less collaborative efforts from business members. Conflicts may arise if business members are expected to abide to a more collective culture.
Work Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Military members may find difficulties in trying to reach consensus with individuals who prioritize individual interests rather than the interests of the employing organization. Business members may lack trust in their military counterparts' expertise and knowledge in jobs.
Hierarchy Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts may arise when business members feel frustrated about the centralized decision-making process of their military counterparts. Conflicts may occur when business members experience contrast managing innovations in the development of complex tasks under the hierarchical culture of their military counterparts.
Market Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict is likely to arise in teams when military members recognize norms of bureaucracy and business members follow norms of decentralization. Military and business members could have conflicting views on the ways that a mission can be accomplished because they each have different perspectives based on their respective organizational objectives.

Table 9. Team Propositions

Potential Risk Areas for Conflict	Propositions
Cohesiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts may occur when military and business have low cohesiveness, which may then affect the team's goal. When excessive cohesiveness dominates a team, conflictive situations may arise if all alternatives and courses of action are not discussed openly or freely among team members.
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts may arise when the military are not confident to take risks upon situations that have not been sufficiently considered in the initial plans. Conflicts are likely to occur between the military and business members when military leaders limit the participation of business team members.

B. LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

As previously mentioned in Chapter I, this study did not attempt to develop theory on organizational culture. Instead, this study was based upon literature review from prior work found in databases, case studies, books, and relevant publications to achieve the research objective. This study should only provide the initial steps for the beginning of further research which may examine and test each of the propositions here suggested. Field research was not conducted. As such, no information or data was gathered from other sources that are not contained in the references employed or listed.

Additionally, the scope and extension of this research was limited by the relatively short time provided by the Naval Postgraduate School to conduct this work.

C. FUTURE RESEARCH

The summary and findings of this research illustrate the propositions created by the author that extend the knowledge of the impact of the cultural differences upon cross-functional teams comprised of military and business personnel. Consequently, these propositions can serve for further research, as follows:

- Determine how these propositions may fit in a framework where the term conflict is used to describe the result of a process where the interaction between military and business personnel may or may not hinder cross-functional teams. This framework must describe systematically the perceived divergences of interest while considering key factors of both organizations such as goals, culture, and decision-making, among others.
- Conduct a field research that would use proven methods to test each of the propositions created in this work. This field research may employ qualitative methods such as surveys, interviews, and observations.
- Conduct a study that would extend the existing literature knowledge about teamwork examining the differences between the values of the military and business personnel and their contribution to or detraction from teamwork.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adler, P. (2001) Market, Hierarchy and Trust: The knowledge Economy and The Future of Capitalism. *Organizational Science*, Vol. 12. pp. 215-234.
- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding Organization Culture*. London. The Crowell Press.
- Annad, V, Clark, M. 7 Zeemer-Bruhn. (2003) Team Knowledge Structure: Matching Task to Information Environment. *Journal of Management Issues*. Vol. 15, p. 15, from ProQuest Databases.
- Bennis, W. (1994). *On Becoming a Leader*. Wilmington, Massachusetts, Trump Medieval by C and C Associates.
- Buck, J. and Lawrence, J. (1981). *Military Leadership*. Beverly Hills, California. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Carley, K. (1992) Organizational Learning and Personnel Turnover. *Organization Science*. Vol. 3, pp. 20-85, from ProQuest Database.
- Clark, Mark, Amundson, S. and Cardy, R. (2002) Cross-Functional Team Decision-making and Learning Outcome: A qualitative illustration. *Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 8, No. 3, from Pro Quest Databases.
- Conger, J and Kanungo, R. (1998). *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, California. Sage Publications Ltd.
- DoD Guide to Integrated Product and Process Development, (1996). IPDD Handbook. Office of the Under Secretary of Defense. (Acquisition and Technology). Washington.
- Dunnette, M. (1966) *Personnel Selection and Placement*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Dyer, W. (1987). *Team Building: Issues and Alternatives*. New York. Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Faris, J. (1977) An Alternative Perspective to Savage and Gabriel .*Armed Forces and Society*, pp. 2, 3, 457-462.
- General Accounting Office (1996). (GAO/RCED-96-159). *A Compressive Strategy is Needed for Cultural Change at FAA*. Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies. Washington, D.C.
- General Accounting Office (2001). (GAO-02-200). *A Report to Congressional Requesters. Military Personnel*. Washington, D.C.

- Goodman, E., Zammuto R. and Gifford, B. (2001) The Competing Values Framework: Understanding the impact of organizational culture on the Quality of Work Life. *Organization Development Journal* Vol. 19, pp. 58-68, from Pro Quest Database.
- Hare, P. (1992). *Groups Team and Social Interaction: Theories and Applications*. New York, New York. Praeger Publisher.
- Hofstede, G. (1984) *Culture's Consequences*. Newbury. Sage Publications.
- Huntington S. (2003). *The Soldier and the State*. London. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Irving, Janis. (1972) *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign Policies Decisions and Fiascos*. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Jackson, Phillip and Messick, S. (1965). The Person the Product and the Response: Conceptual Problem in Assessment of Creativity. *Journal of Personality*. Vol. 5, pp. 32-60, from Proquest Database.
- Jones, Gary. (1995) *Organizational Theory: Text and Cases*, Reading. Massachusetts. Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Kanter, R. (1983) *The Change Master: Innovations for Productivity in the American Corporation*. New York. Simon and Schuster Publisher.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business Press.
- Martin, L. and Orthner, D. *The Organization Family: Work and Families Linkages in the Military*. New York: Praeger Publisher.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary(1993). 10th ed., s.v. "Culture".
- Miller, D. (2001). *Commanding Officers*. London, Great Britain. John Murray Publishers.
- Mohrman, S., Cohen, S. and Mohrman, A. (1995) *Designing Team Based Organizations*. San Francisco, California. Jossey-Bass- Publisher.
- Moskos, C. (1998) *The Military: More than Just a Job*. New York. International Defense Publishers.
- Ott, J. (1989) *The Organizational Culture Perspective*. Chicago. The Dorsey Press.
- Parker, G. (1996) *Team Player and Team Work*. San Francisco. Joseph Bass Publisher.
- Peach, R. and Durden, G. (2003) *Maneuver Warfare: A New Military Paradigm for Business Decision Making*. *Management Decision*. Vol. 4. From Proquest Databases.

- Ross, M. H. (1993). *The Culture of Conflict*. Michigan. Yale University Press.
- Rubin, D. Pruitt and Kim, S. (1996). *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and settlement*. Vol. 5, p. 5. New York.
- Saffold, G. S. (1988) . *Culture Traits, Strength and Organization Performance: Moving beyond “Strong” Culture*. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 546-558, from Jstor Database.
- Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 2nd ed. San Francisco, California.
- Schneider, Benjamin. (1996) *Creating a Climate and Culture for Sustainable Organizational Change*. *Organizational Dynamics*. Vol. 8, pp. 6-19, from Proquest Database.
- Schmitt, N. and Chan, D. (1998) *Personnel Selection: A Theoretical Approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sethi, R., Smith, D. and Park, W. (2001) *Cross-Functional Product Development Teams, Creativity, and the Innovativeness of New Consumer Products*. *Journal of Marketing Research*. from ProQuest Database.
- Sorley, L. (1981) *The Will-o'-the-wisp General*. Beverly Hills. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Souters, J. (2000). *Culture in the Uniformed Organizations*, in *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (Eds.) Neal in Ashkanasy, Celeste P. Widerom, and Mark Peterson. Sage Publications. INC: Thousand Oaks, New Jersey.
- Stein, A. (1976) *Conflict and Cohesion: A Review of the Literature*. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 143-72.
- Swain, K. and Mills, V. (2003). *Implicit Communication in Novice and Expert Teams*. *Defense Science Technology*. Edinburgh South Australia.
- Taylor, R. and Rosenbach, W. (2000). *Military Leadership*. Boulder, Colorado and United Kingdom. Westview Press.
- Thomas, K. (1994) *Effect of Cultural Diversity in Management Training Groups*. Presented as a Symposium at the Academy Management Meeting. Dallas, Texas.
- Trainor, S. C. (2000). *Values, Culture, and Civil-Military Relations: Implications for the Postmodern Military*. U.S. Army War College. Pennsylvania.
- Tweeddale, J. W. (1986). *Improving Research the Research Transition Process: A Perspective on Research Transition*. (Report Nr NPRDC SR 86-2). Navy Research and Development Center. San Diego, California.

Ulmer, Jr. (2000). American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century. A Report of the CSIS International Security Program. Washington D.C.

Vincola, A. (1998) Cultural Change is the Work/Life Solution. Workforce; ABI/INFORM Global. From Pro Quest Databases.

Weber, Max (1947) The Theory of Social and Economic Reform. (Henderson and Parson, translator).New York: Free Press.

Williamson, Oliver (1975) Market and Hierarchy: Analysis Antitrust Implications. New York Press.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Professor Douglas A. Brook
Dean, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
4. Professor Roxanne V. Zolin
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
5. Professor Leslie E. Sekerka
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
6. LCL Thomas Crouch
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California